

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

JONATHAN E. WATKINS,	Case No. 3:15-cv-00346-MMD-WGC
Plaintiff,	
v.	ORDER ACCEPTING AND ADOPTING
	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF
JAMES STOGNER, et al.,	MAGISTRATE JUDGE
	WILLIAM G. COBB
Defendant.	

**I. SUMMARY**

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (ECF No. 33) (“R&R”) recommending granting Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (“Defendants’ Motion”) (ECF No. 23). Plaintiff had until November 8, 2017 to object. To date, no objection to the R&R has been filed.

**II. RELEVANT BACKGROUND**

Plaintiff sues multiple defendants for events that took place while Plaintiff was incarcerated at Northern Nevada Correctional Center (“NNCC”). (ECF. no. 7 at 1.) Following screening, the Court permitted Plaintiff to proceed on two claims: (1) Count I for First Amendment Free Exercise and Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000 (“RLUIPA”) claim against Defendants NNCC Warden Isidro Baca and chaplain James Stogner; and (2) Count III for Equal Protection Clause violations claim against Stronger. (ECF No. 8 at 3-7.) The relevant facts are recited in the R&R (ECF No. 33 at 6-7, 9), which the Court adopts.

### 1     **III.     DISCUSSION**

2           This Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or  
3 recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party  
4 timely objects to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, then the court is  
5 required to “make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the [report and  
6 recommendation] to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In light of Plaintiffs’  
7 objections, the Court has engaged in a *de novo* review to determine whether to adopt  
8 Magistrate Judge Cobb’s recommendation. Where a party fails to object, however, the  
9 court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject  
10 of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has  
11 recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s report and  
12 recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See United States v. Reyna-Tapia*,  
13 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review employed by the  
14 district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no objections were  
15 made); *see also Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003)  
16 (reading the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *Reyna-Tapia* as adopting the view that district  
17 courts are not required to review “any issue that is not the subject of an objection.”). Thus,  
18 if there is no objection to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, then the court may accept  
19 the recommendation without review. *See, e.g., Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d at 1226  
20 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge’s recommendation to which no objection  
21 was filed).

22           Plaintiff failed to file an objection. Nevertheless, the Court finds it appropriate to  
23 conduct a *de novo* review to determine whether to adopt the R&R. The Magistrate Judge  
24 recommends granting summary judgment in favor of Defendants based upon Plaintiff’s  
25 failure to raise a genuine issue of material fact to oppose summary judgment. In particular,  
26 the Magistrate Judge found that the undisputed evidence shows that Defendants did not  
27 place any substantial burden on Plaintiff’s exercise of his religion in support of Count I.  
28 (ECF No. 33 at 6-9.) As for Count III, which is premised on Stronger’s alleged dealings

1 with the Muslim community faith group prison reform student minister, Derek Perkins, the  
2 Magistrate Judge found in part that Stronger undisputedly did not have such dealings with  
3 Mr. Perkins. (*Id.* at 9-11.) Having reviewed the R&R and the briefs relating to Defendant's  
4 Motion, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge and will adopt the R&R.

5 **IV. CONCLUSION**

6 It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that the Report and  
7 Recommendation of Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (ECF No. 33) is accepted and  
8 adopted in full.

9 It is further ordered that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 23)  
10 is granted.

11 The Clerk is directed to enter judgment in favor of Defendants and close this case.

12 DATED THIS 27<sup>th</sup> day of December 2017.

13  
14 

15 MIRANDA M. DU  
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28